



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/332,244	06/11/1999	MICHAEL D. ELLIS	UV-84	2681

7590 12/19/2006
G VICTOR TREYZ
FISH & NEAVE
1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 100201104

EXAMINER

LONSBERRY, HUNTER B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/19/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/332,244

Applicant(s)

ELLIS ET AL.

Examiner

Hunter B. Lonsberry

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 250 and 571-886 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 250 and 571-886 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/16/06, 6/8/06.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 8/31/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Examiner has withdrawn the indicated allowability of claim 250.

Due to the large number of claims, the Examiner has picked a representative set of claims for examination. Newly added claims 650-886 substantially corresponds to previously addressed claims 330-649, which appear below.

Applicant's failure to traverse the Official Notice(s) taken in the previous action is viewed as admission of prior art.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. The indicated allowability of claims 2509 and 645-649 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Slezak. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2623

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 250, 330-344, 346, 350-362, 364-368, 372-374, 377-397, 400, 401, 405, 407-420, 423, 427-439, 441-444, 449-451, 454-473, 477, 478, 482, 484-505, 509-521, 523-525, 531-533, 536-556, 559, 560, 564, 566-587, 591-605, 607, 612-614, 617-637, 640, 641, and 643 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,657,072 to Aristides in view of U.S. Patent 5,805,763 to Lawler and U.S. Patent 6,006,257 to Slezak.

Regarding claim 250, Aristides discloses an interactive television program guide system in which television programs are recorded and retrieved on-demand for a number of users, the system comprising:

a remote media server configured to store and retrieve programs on-demand for each user; distribution equipment configured to distribute to each user programs that are retrieved on-demand by the remote media server for each user (column 5, lines 40-57. column 6, lines 21-33);

and interactive program guide television equipment on which an interactive television program guide is implemented and wherein the interactive television program guide is configured to (column 4, lines 15-49):

generate a retrieval request in response to the user indicating a desire to play back a program on-demand with the remote media server (column 5, lines 40-57. column 6, lines 21-33),

and wherein the remote media server is further configured to:

retrieve a program in response to the retrieval request generated by the interactive television program guide (column 5, lines 40-57. column 6, lines 21-33).

Aristides fails to disclose an EPG that generates a record request in response to the user indicating a desire to record a program on-demand with the remote media server, storing the requested program remotely and an Internet service system.

Lawler discloses that user may use an EPG to select a program to record (figure 4a/b, column 10, line 65-column 11, line 6, column 12, lines 29-32), this record request is then transmitted to the headend, and equipment 32 at the headend may record the requested programming (column 12, line 58-column 13, line 13, column 4, lines 20-34).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the EPG of Aristides to enable a user to select a future program for recording as taught by Lawler, thus optimizing storage space on the recording device and bandwidth by only offering programs which are of interest to the users.

While the combination of Aristides and Lawler discloses the use of a WAN or MAN, the combination is silent with regards to an Internet service system.

Slezak discloses in figure 1, a headend 510 which is connected via Internet 530 to a number of video servers 520a, forming an Internet enabled service system, customized secondary programming, including interactive advertising is sent to the

viewers house at the option of the viewer, this may subsidize the cost of a movie, and the advertisements may be enabled by a correlation between a users demographic data and a movie scene (column 3, line 63-column 4, line 13, 33-48, 58-column 5, line 60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides and Lawler to utilize the Internet enabled service system, as taught by Slezak for the advantages of enabling a user to receive cheaper programming which is subsidized by advertisements that are correlated to a user's demographics (column 5, lines 15-26, column 3, lines 63-column 4, line 4).

Regarding claims 330 and 334, Aristides discloses an interactive television program guide system in which television programs are recorded and played back on--demand by a remote media server for a number of users (column 5, lines 26-57, column 6, lines 21-33), the system comprising:

interactive program guide television equipment 22 on which an interactive television program guide 38 is implemented and wherein the interactive television program guide (column 4, lines 15-49): is configured to :

provide the user with an opportunity to indicate a desire to access a directory of program listings for programs recorded by the remote media server (column 6, lines 28-33);

and provide a directory of program listings for programs recorded by the remote media server in response to the user indicating a desire to view a directory of program listings for the programs recorded by the remote media server (column 6, lines 28-33).

Aristides fails to disclose providing a user with an opportunity to indicate at least one program for recording by the remote media server and the use of an Internet service system.

Lawler discloses that user may use an EPG to select a program to record (figure 4a/b, column 10, line 65-column 11, line 6, column 12, lines 29-32), this record request is then transmitted to the headend, and equipment at the headend may record the requested programming (column 12, line 58-column 13, line 13, column 4, lines 20-34).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the EPG of Aristides to enable a user to select a future program for recording as taught by Lawler, thus optimizing storage space on the recording device and bandwidth by only offering programs which are of interest to the users.

While the combination of Aristides and Lawler discloses the use of a WAN or MAN, the combination is silent with regards to an Internet service system.

Slezak discloses in figure 1, a headend 510 which is connected via Internet 530 to a number of video servers 520a, forming an Internet enabled service system, customized secondary programming, including interactive advertising is sent to the viewers house at the option of the viewer, this may subsidize the cost of a movie, and the advertisements may be enabled by a correlation between a users demographic data and a movie scene (column 3, line 63-column 4, line 13, 33-48, 58-column 5, line 60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides and Lawler to utilize the Internet enabled service system, as taught by Slezak for the advantages of enabling a user to receive cheaper programming which is subsidized by advertisements that are correlated to a user's demographics (column 5, lines 15-26, column 3, lines 63-column 4, line 4).

Regarding claims 331 and 332, Aristides discloses a VOD system, which records programming for later playback, and is displayed in an EPG (column 6, lines 21-33).

Aristides and Lawler do not disclose sorting program listings by theme and title.

The examiner takes official notice that sorting program listings by theme and title is notoriously well known in the art. Sorting by theme and title, enables a user to rapidly find programs that they are interested in, for example a user who desires to watch an action movie can quickly browse action movies while ignoring romantic comedies, likewise a user who knows the name of their favourite program can rapidly locate it by the first letter of the title.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides and Lawler to sort program listings by theme and title, thus enabling a user to rapidly find programs of interest.

Regarding claim 333, Aristides discloses a VOD system, which records programming for later playback, and is displayed in an EPG (column 6, lines 21-33).

Aristides and Lawler do not disclose overlaying the program listings over a currently watched program.

The examiner takes official notice that the use of a partial screen EPG that displays program listings over a currently watched program is well known in the art. Partial screen guides enable a user to continue to follow a program while browsing listings of other programs.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides and Lawler to utilize a partial screen program guide, thus enabling a user to browse program listings while continuing to view a program.

Regarding claim 335, Aristides discloses that the interactive television program guide is further configured to display information about at least one of the programs recorded by the remote media server in response to the user indicating a desire to view information about the at least one program recorded by the remote media server (column 6, lines 21-33).

Regarding claims 336-339, Aristides discloses a VOD system.

Aristides and Lawler do not disclose the use of a fast forward, rewind command, stop or pause command.

The examiner takes official notice that the use of fast forward, rewind, stop and pause commands transmitted via a user interface to a remote VOD server to control the

Art Unit: 2623

display of video is notoriously well known in the art. Play control commands are well known in enabling a user to review a portion of the video for analysis, and enabling a user to view the video at a later time.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides and Lawler to utilize a fast-forward, rewind, stop, and pause command, thus enabling a user to have more control over the display of the received video and allowing the user to view the programming at their own pace.

Regarding claim 340, Aristides discloses a system, which automatically caches all current programs.

Aristides fails to disclose caching a program in response to a user indicating a desire to cache a program.

Lawler discloses that user may use an EPG to select a program to cache (figure 4a/b, column 10, line 65-column 11, line 6, column 12, lines 29-32), this cache request is then transmitted to the headend, and equipment 32 at the headend may record the requested programming (column 12, line 58-column 13, line 13, column 4, lines 20-34).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the EPG of Aristides to enable a user to select a future program for caching as taught by Lawler, thus optimizing storage space on the recording device by only recording programs of interest for a specific user.

Regarding claim 341, Aristides discloses that the remote media server is further configured to automatically cache all current programs; and the remote media server is further configured to play back at least a portion of a cached program in response to a user indicating a desire to view at least a portion of the cached program with the interactive television program guide (column 5, lines 40-57, column 6, lines 21-33).

Regarding claims 342-343, Aristides discloses a remote server, which provides VOD of TV programs.

The combination of Aristides and Lawler does not disclose enabling a user to delete a program via the EPG or where the remote server automatically deletes recorded programs.

The examiner takes official notice that the use of a GUI to select files to delete, and a storage device which is configured to automatically delete data is notoriously well known in the art. For example, users may use a GUI to delete files off their hard drive as to free up space for new files, and servers or caching devices may be configured to delete files aged past a certain date when free space is low, thus enabling new files to be stored.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides and Lawler to enable a user to delete a file (stored program) via the EPG, and to configure the server to automatically delete files, thus ensuring that free space would be available to record new programs.

Regarding claim 346, Aristides discloses that the interactive program guide television equipment comprises user television equipment 26; the remote media server is further configured to store and play back on-demand program guide data associated with the programs stored by the remote media server; and the interactive television program guide is further configured to present program guide data on the user television equipment to a user as if an associated program were being originally aired (column 6, lines 21-33, column 8, lines 36-52).

Regarding claims 350-351, see claim 330.

Regarding claim 352, see claim 331.

Regarding claim 353, see claim 332.

Regarding claim 354, see claim 333.

Regarding claim 355, see claim 334.

Regarding claim 356, see claim 335.

Regarding claims 357-360, see claims 336-339.

Regarding claims 361-362, see claims 340-341.

Regarding claims 364-365, see claims 342-343.

Regarding claim 366, see claim 344.

Regarding claim 367, see claim 346.

Regarding claim 368, see claim 348.

Regarding claim 372, Aristides discloses a VOD system.

Aristides does not disclose recording a program grouping having at least one program for recording.

Lawler discloses that a user may select a program to record, for one time only or for a group of programs (record every week option 146, figure 9, column 12, lines 29-43).

Regarding claims 373-374, Aristides discloses a VOD system.

Aristides and Lawler do not disclose the use of a copy protection that prohibits the recording of a program.

The examiner takes official notice that the use of a bit to disable copying and displaying a copy protection message is notoriously well known in the art. For example a read only flag, CSS protection on a DVD.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides and Lawler to utilize a copy protection bit to prohibit unlicensed copying, thus protecting the revenue streams of a content provider.

Regarding claim 377, Aristides discloses a VOD system.

Lawler discloses displaying an icon, which indicates a program to be recorded (column 8, lines 35-53).

Aristides and Lawler do not disclose displaying listings for future programs to be recorded.

The examiner takes official notice that displaying listings for programs to be recorded is notoriously well known in the art. For example, a VCR menu, which lists programs to be recorded and enables a user to remember which programs they have set to record.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides and Lawler to display a list of programs to be recorded, thus enabling a user to remember which programs they have set to record.

Regarding claims 378-379, Aristides discloses a VOD system.

Lawler discloses displaying program listings, an icon indicating that a program is to be recorded may be displayed within a program tile 88 (column 8, lines 43-53), thus displaying listings for programs to record and programs not to be recorded.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify Aristides to display the icons of Lawler, thus enabling a user to remember which programs they have set to record.

Regarding claims 380-381, and 383-384, Aristides discloses a VOD system.

Aristides and Lawler do not disclose the use of billing information for recording programs on the remote server and utilizing a flat fee.

The examiner takes official notice that the use of charging a flat fee for access to remote data storage services is notoriously well known in the art. Flat fees encourage a user to use a service more often than an unmetered service.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides and Lawler to utilize a flat fee for access to remote data storage services thus enticing a user to use a service more often.

Regarding claim 382, 385, 388, Aristides discloses a VOD system.

Aristides and Lawler do not disclose billing a user based upon the length of a program and identifying the billed program.

The examiner takes official notice that billing a user based on the amount of time a service is used is notoriously well known in the art. For example, when a user uses long distance service, a user is billed based on the total number of minutes the service is used for a corresponding dialed number, thus a user who uses a service more often pays more than a user who uses it less.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides and Lawler to generate billing information based upon the total time a service is used (the length of the program), thus compensating the service provider for a user who records a longer program more than a user who records a shorter one.

Regarding claims 386-387, Aristides discloses a VOD system.

Aristides and Lawler do not disclose a flat fee for playback of programs of identifying played back programs in billing information.

The examiner takes official notice that presenting a billing statement identifying watched programs and charging a flat fee for accessing programming is notoriously well known in the art. Flat fees encourage a user to use a service more often than an unmetered service.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides and Lawler to generate billing information on a billing statement identifying programs watched, and charging a flat fee, thus enabling a user to keep track of programs they have viewed, and encouraging a user to playback programs more often.

Regarding claims 389-390, Aristides discloses a VOD service.

Aristides and Lawler do not disclose the EPG indicating to a user the charge associated with playback of a program, and charging a flat fee.

The examiner takes official notice that indicating a user how much it will cost to play back a program and charging a flat fee for accessing programming is notoriously well known in the art. Flat fees encourage a user to use a service more often than an unmetered service.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides and Lawler to indicate to a user the charge associated with retrieving programming and charging a flat fee for access, thus

Art Unit: 2623

enabling a user to make an informed choice on viewing a program and encouraging a user to playback programs more often.

Regarding claim 391, Aristides discloses a VOD service.

Aristides and Lawler do not disclose the EPG indicating to a user the charge associated with playback of a program, and charging a fee based on the length of the program

The examiner takes official notice that indicating a user how much it will cost to play back a program and billing a user based on the amount of time a service is used is notoriously well known in the art. For example, when a user uses long distance service, a user is billed based on the total number of minutes the service is used for a corresponding dialed number, thus a user who uses a service more often pays more than a user who uses it less.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides and Lawler to indicate to a user the charge associated with retrieving programming and generate billing information based upon the total time a service is used (the length of the program), thus compensating the service provider for a user who records a longer program more than a user who records a shorter one.

Regarding claims 392-393, see claim 380-381.

Regarding claim 394, see claim 382.

Regarding claim 395-396, see claim 380.

Regarding claim 397, see claim 382.

Regarding claims 400-401, Aristides discloses a VOD system that records TV programming.

Aristides and Lawler fail to disclose allowing a user to set an audio and video format for the recorded information.

The examiner takes official notice that setting an audio and video format while operating capture software for the playback of an audiovisual program is notoriously well known in the art, for example Adobe Premier software allows a user to set the quality of the audio and how many channels, as well as the resolution of the video and the format to which it is to be saved in.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides and Lawler to enable a user to set the audio and video format for the recorded programs, thus allowing a user to set the quality of the played back audio and video.

Regarding claim 405, Aristides discloses a VOD system that stores programs being broadcast for later playback by a number of users (column 5, lines 40-47, and column 6, lines 21-33).

Regarding claims 484-488, see claims 79-83.

Regarding claims 407-420, 423, 427-439, 441-444, 449-451, 454-473, 477, 478, and 482, see claims 330-344, 346, 350-362, 364-368, 372-374, 377-397, 400, 401, and 405.

Regarding claims 489-505, 509-521, 523-524, 531-533, 536-556, 559, 560, and 564, see claims 330-344, 346, 350-362, 364-368, 372-374, 377-397, 400, 401, and 405.

Regarding claims 566-570, see claims 79-83.

Regarding claims 571-587, 591-605, 607, 612-614, 617-637, 640, 641, and 643, see claims 330-344, 346, 350-362, 364-368, 372-374, 377-397, 400, 401, and 405.

4. Claims 344, 421, 525, and 606 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,657,072 to Aristides in view of U.S. Patent 5,805,763 to Lawler and U.S. Patent 6,006,257 to Slezak in further view of U.S. Patent 6,441,832 to Tao.

Regarding claim 344, Aristides discloses a VOD server, which plays back TV programs.

Aristides, Lawler and Slezak do not disclose the use of a playlist to playback programs.

Tao discloses in figure 1, a playlist, which may be created by a user, after the playlist is created it is played back by a server for viewing (column 7, lines 46-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides, Lawler and Slezak to utilize playlist creation software as taught by Tao, thus allowing a user to view a number of programs in any order they wished.

5. Claims 345 and 422 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,657,072 to Aristides in view of U.S. Patent 5,805,763 to Lawler and U.S. Patent 6,006,257 to Slezak in further view of U.S. Patent 5,761,607 to Gudesen.

Regarding claim 345, Aristides discloses a VOD system.

Aristides, Lawler and Slezak fail to disclose an EPG enabled device, which stores files received from a remote server for later playback.

Gudesen discloses a STB receiver in which a user uses a control interface 207 to select VOD files from a VOD library, the data is then transmitted to a user device for later viewing (column 5, lines 6-40).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides, Lawler and Slezak to utilize the local storage of Gudesen thus enabling a user to perform trick play functions without utilizing additional bandwidth on the network (Gudeson, column 7, lines 17-25).

Art Unit: 2623

6. Claims 370-371, 447, 448, 529, 530, 610, 611 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,657,072 to Aristides in view of U.S. Patent 5,805,763 to Lawler and U.S. Patent 6,006,257 to Slezak in further view of U.S. Patent 5,850,218 to LaJoie.

Regarding claims 370-371, Aristides discloses a VOD system.

Aristides, Lawler and Slezak do not disclose recording a PPV program.

LaJoie discloses a system in which the interactive television program guide is further configured to provide the user with an opportunity to purchase a pay-per-view program and the EPG is configured to record the purchased pay-per-view program (column 21, lines 42-49).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides, Lawler and Slezak to allow a user to record a purchased pay per view programming as taught by LaJoie, thus enabling a user to view a program at their own convenience.

7. Claims 375-376, 452, 453, 534, 535, 615, 616 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,657,072 to Aristides in view of U.S. Patent 5,805,763 to Lawler and U.S. Patent 6,006,257 to Slezak in further view of U.S. Patent 5,778,181 to Hidary.

Regarding claims 375 and 376, Aristides discloses a VOD system, which stores previously broadcasted TV programs.

Aristides, Lawler and Selzak do not disclose recording interactive content associated with a program.

Hidary discloses a video system in which hyperlinks are embedded in the VBI of a broadcasted video, a user may record the video and access the interactive content (column 3, lines 29-50, 58-68, column 4, lines 12-33, column 6, lines 51-57).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides, Lawler and Slezak to include the storage of interactive content as taught by Hidary thus allowing a user to learn more about the previously broadcasted subject matter.

8. Claims 398-399, 475, 476, 557,558, 638, and 639 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,657,072 to Aristides in view of U.S. Patent 5,805,763 to Lawler and U.S. Patent 6,006,257 to Slezak in further view of U.S. Patent 6,473,559 to Knudson.

Regarding claims 398-399, 475, 476, 557,558, 638, and 639 , Aristides discloses a VOD system.

Aristides, Lawler and Slezak do not disclose providing a user an opportunity to input a parental control code to control the recording and playback of programming.

Knudson discloses an EPG in which a user may input a parental code to prohibit the recording of programming which would be inappropriate for children (Figures 7a/b, column 8, lines 11-54).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides, Lawler and Slezak to allow a user to enter a parental code as taught by Knudson thus prohibiting the recording of inappropriate material.

Aristides, Lawler, Slezak and Knudson do not disclose the use of a parental code to prohibit the playback of recorded programming.

The examiner takes official notice that the use of a parental code to control the playback of recorded material is notoriously well known in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Aristides, Lawler, Slezak and Knudson to allow a user to enter a parental code prohibiting the playback of inappropriate recorded material.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hunter B. Lonsberry whose telephone number is 571-272-7298. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday during normal business hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HBL


Hunter B. Lonsberry
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2623